



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/562,361

12/27/2005

Hideaki Takahashi

1830.1018

4148

21171 7590 11/24/2008  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

LE, HOA VAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/24/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/562,361	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAKAHASHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hoa V. Le	<b>Art Unit</b> 1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/27/05, 11/13/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

This application is up for consideration.

- I. It is recognize that applicants are overseas.
- II. In view of the complexity of the application, this Office action is made.
- III. The prior art submissions have been considered to the extent of (a) English language as provided and (b) chemical structures in the non-English language disclosures only.

(1) JP8230328 is appeared to be relevant to the instant claims. Especially, chemical structures on paragraphs 0029, 0034 are appeared to be relevant. Therefore, an English language translation or about the same is requested. However, applicant, assignee and/or their counsel may and should disagree on and for the record that there is no relevant embodiment. Accordingly, no English language translation is submitted.

(2) JP2001096926 is appeared to be relevant to the instant claims. Especially, chemical structure III on paragraph 0018 is appeared to be relevant.

Art Unit: 1795

Therefore, an English language translation or about the same is requested.

However, applicant, assignee and/or their counsel may and should disagree on and for the record that there is no relevant embodiment. Accordingly, no English language translation is submitted.

(3) JP9278695 is appeared to be relevant to the instant claims. Especially, chemical structure I on paragraphs 0015 is appeared to be relevant. Therefore, an English language translation or about the same is requested. However, applicant, assignee and/or their counsel may and should disagree on and for the record that there is no relevant embodiment. Accordingly, no English language translation is submitted.

(4) JP6115255 is appeared to be relevant to the instant claims. Especially, chemical structure on page 3, top right paragraph is appeared to be relevant. Therefore, an English language translation or about the same is requested. However, applicant, assignee and/or their counsel may and should disagree on and for the record that there is no relevant embodiment. Accordingly, no English language translation is submitted.

(5) WO 02/098674 is appeared to be relevant to the instant claims. Especially, chemical structure on top of page 3 appeared to be relevant. Therefore, an English language translation or about the same is requested. However,

Art Unit: 1795

applicant, assignee and/or their counsel may and should disagree on and for the record that there is no relevant embodiment. Accordingly, no English language translation is submitted.

An allowed claim or patent would have no value when someone shows that there is at least one useable or applicable embodiment in at least one of the above references. Therefore, an early and timely English language translation or about the same is requested to be provided in the next response to this Office action in order for each of them to be considered timely.

IV. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

#### Lack of Unity Requirement

Claims 1-21 are drawn to more than one inventive concept (as defined by PCT Rule 13), and accordingly, a restriction is required according to the provision of PCT Rule 13.2

PCT Rule 13.2 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a general inventive concept (requirement of unity of invention).

PCT Rule 13.2 states that unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

Art Unit: 1795

Annex B, Part I(b), provides that "special technical features" mean those technical features, which, as a whole, define a contribution over the prior art.

Annex B, Part I(e), provides combinations of different categories of claims and states:

"The method for determining unity of invention under Rule 13 shall be construed as permitting, in particular, the inclusion of any one of the following combinations of claims of different categories in the same international application:.

- (i) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for a use of the said product, or
- (ii) in addition to an independent claim for a given process, an independent claim for an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process, or
- (iii) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process .... "

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted. About the same criticalities are also applied to distinct species.

Claims 1-21, drawn to triphenolic compounds of the general formula (1) having many distinct species.

(a) For  $R_a$

(1) alkyl of C1-18 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered

Art Unit: 1795

timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(2) cycloalkyl of C5-10 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(3) alkoxy of C1-4 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(4) all halogens are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(5) aryl and arakyl of C7-14 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(b) For  $R_b$

(1) hydrogen and it homologue C1 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(2) alkyl of C2-4 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be

Art Unit: 1795

used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(3) all halogens are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

For R<sub>c</sub>

(1) hydrogen and it homologue C1 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(2) alkyl of C2-18 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(3) all halogens are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(4) cyano being patentably distinct species from

(5) cycloalkyl of C5-10 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(6) alkoxy of C1-4 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show



Art Unit: 1795

otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

(7) aryl and arakyl of C7-14 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

\* m and n of 1-5 are not patentably different or distinct (Therefore, no election of species is made. However, applicants should disagree or show otherwise in the next response to this Office action in order for it to be considered timely. The disagreement or showing will be used as evidence to further made an election of subspecies) being patentably distinct species from

The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required **(1) to choose and elect a single disclosed distinct chemical structure (2) with all chemical elements in the elected chemical structure (3) together with their bonding connections among and between the elements in the elected chemical structure for a computer generating search** for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable for an initial search processing step, such as: no specific portion as that in claim 1, two proportions as that in claim 20, simple plurality portions as that in claim 10, complex portions as that in claim 14 for examples.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 1795

Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

However, applicants may and should disagree and state on and for the record that there is no patentably different or distinct with respect any chemical structure being read on or within the general formula (1). **If there is no proper election in response to this Office action, no specific chemical structure of the general formula (I) will be considered or searched. No argument to any chemical structure of the general formula (I) will be considered. It is now notified for the record.**

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, **especially claim 1**, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

V. Other issues have not been considered until a timely and proper election is made and resolved.

Art Unit: 1795

VI. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoa V. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1332.

The examiner can normally be reached from 7:30 AM to 4:30 PM on Monday through Thursday and about the same time of most Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526.

Applicants may file a paper by (1) fax with a central facsimile receiving number 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hoa V. Le/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795

111908